

065

ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

From the PRINCETON REVIEW for January 1862.


SECOND EDITION.

[Charles Briggs, Jr.]

PHILADELPHIA:
WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN,
No. 606 CHESTNUT STREET.

1862.

800



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant



ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

No two nations are bound together by so many bonds of sympathy and interest as England and America. England is our mother. That one word is a volume. We might ponder long on its meaning without exhausting its fulness. During the colonial period of our history, ninety-nine hundredths of our population came from Great Britain. And since the establishment of our national independence, the accessions to our numbers from other sources have been in a great measure absorbed and assimilated. Immigrants from the continent of Europe have produced no perceptible difference in our language, laws, or institutions. England has transmitted to us her Anglo-Saxon life. We are bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh. The English oak has been transplanted to this country and filled the land. What we are, is but the normal development of English life under new conditions. Whether the way in which her children grow up and reveal themselves in lands other than her own, be in accordance with her taste and judgment or not, they are none the less her children. She is bound to us and we are bound to her by the closest ties of consanguinity. With community of blood is connected community in language, literature, modes of thought, laws, institutions, and religion. We are the two great Protestant powers of the world, doing more than all other nations combined, for what we both regard as the best interests of man and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. This bond of a common faith is even stronger than that of lineage. That those who profess allegiance to the same Lord, who have a common faith and hope, should be enemies, is a greater violence to their normal

TOLSON

relationship than contention among brothers. Neither can injure the other, without thereby injuring the cause of Christ. The two nations thus closely united by the bonds of common parentage, of a common intellectual, political, and religious life, have their material interests so involved, that the prosperity or adversity of the one is inevitably shared by the other.

We feel free to say, that America has always felt and acted as became her intimate relationship to England. Even in the same family, when widely extended, there will be occasional misunderstandings and collisions, while the family bond remains unbroken; so there have been doubtless on our part many hard feelings, and unkind utterances and acts towards our mother country. Nevertheless the national feeling in America, the heart of our people, as a people, has been loyal to our race. We have had a pride in the glories of England as the glories of our own ancestors. We have had respect for the intelligence, the courage, the truthfulness, and honour which belong to the character of Englishmen. We have ever felt that they and we belong to the same household of faith, and that both *κατὰ σάρκα* and *κατὰ πνεῦμα* they are our nearest relations on earth. England has never passed through an hour of trial without the sympathy and prayers of the American people. In the long wars which arose out of the French revolution, notwithstanding the still unallayed passions of our war for independence, and our national gratitude to France, and our natural sympathy with a people goaded to madness by centuries of oppression, yet the mass of intelligent and Christian Americans were in heart on the side of England. The same is true as to the Crimean war. And during the terrible rebellion in India, prayer ascended from every American church and every family altar in behalf of our brethren in the faith. When the Prince of Wales recently visited the United States, his journey through the country, although intended to be private, was a protracted ovation. "Welcome to the son of Victoria," was the favourite legend for arches and gateways. There could not be a more unmistakeable evidence of the national feeling than was thus afforded. And now, in the midst of angry excitement, when news reaches our land that England's model mother and queen has suffered the greatest earthly bereavement, the American journals are filled with eulogiums

on the character of the late Prince Consort, and with expressions of condolence with the British sovereign and people. We claim, therefore, that the national feeling in America towards England has always been healthful and right, in harmony with the intimate relationship of the two nations. We have classes of people inimical to Great Britain, and papers, generally edited by Englishmen, or by other foreigners imbued with an anti-Anglican feeling, but the facts to which we have referred, and many others of like import, which might be adduced, prove that as a people we have been loyal to our ancestry and to our race.

Our time of trial has now come. We are engaged in a struggle for our national life, for law, order, and liberty. A rebellion, designed to overthrow our government, for the avowed purpose "of conserving, perpetuating, and extending the system of domestic slavery," has contrived to enlist in its support nearly a third part of the people and resources of the United States. With this rebellion we are now engaged in a deadly conflict. Constitutional, anti-slavery England throws the whole weight of her sympathy in favour of this unrighteous pro-slavery rebellion. This is an event so unexpected, so contrary to what we had a right to anticipate, that it is only by slow degrees American Christians have yielded to the conviction that such is really the fact. To overwhelming evidence they have at last been forced reluctantly and sorrowfully to submit. We were not surprised that the aristocratic class in England took part against us. The failure of republicanism, as they erroneously regarded it, was in itself to them a matter of gratulation; and the sentiment candidly expressed in public by Sir Lytton Bulwer, was natural, if not honourable. He said that the balance of power between nations required the dissolution of the American Union; that this country under one government, threatened to overshadow Europe and disturb the political equilibrium. Neither were we surprised that the cotton manufacturers took sides with the cotton producers. Human nature is too often blinded and perverted by self-interest to make any new manifestation of its weakness a matter of surprise. The privileged class and the cotton spinners, however, do not constitute England. We had faith in the heart of the people, and especially in the Christian principle of the middle classes. We

confidently believed that the mass of the controlling population of Great Britain would prove faithful to their professions, and true to the great interests of justice and humanity. In this we have been mistaken. The general tone of the public press, the utterances of representative men, and the action of the government and of its officials, are the only indexes of national sentiment to which foreigners have access. We shall rejoice to find that all these deceive us, but their concurrent indications force us to the conclusion, that England has in this great struggle taken the side of lawlessness, of slavery, and of violence, from selfish and dishonourable motives. This is a conclusion to which we have come with much the same reluctance that we should admit the dishonour of a gray-headed father. But how can we resist it?

We know the character of this rebellion. We know that it is unprovoked, that it is made simply in the interests of slavery. We know that it has been brought about by the long-continued machinations of able, but unprincipled men; that it has been consummated by acts of the grossest fraud, treachery, and spoliation. We know that it is directed to the overthrow of a just, equal, and beneficent government, and that, in all human probability, its success must be attended by the greatest evils for generations to come. It may be said that our English brethren do not know or believe all this; that they take a very different view of the subject; that they persuade themselves that slavery has nothing to do with this conflict; that it is a mere contention for power, or a struggle between a tariff and anti-tariff party. But why do they so regard it? Romanists refuse to recognise in the German Reformation any religious movement. Luther, Calvin, Latimer, and Cranmer, according to them, were wicked men, governed in their resistance to the church of Rome by the basest motives. They are probably sincere in this conviction, but to Protestants they are not the less inexcusable for taking good for evil, or for siding with the evil against the good. It is for the state of mind which leads to the dominant judgment of the English people in favour of an unjustifiable pro-slavery rebellion, that the Christian world must hold them accountable.

That the prevailing feeling and judgment in England are in favour of this rebellion, is to us painfully evident. The

prompt recognition of the Southern Confederacy as belligerents, entitled to be treated in all respects as equal with the constituted and acknowledged government of the United States, was itself a most unfriendly act. That Confederacy has no recognised existence at home or abroad as a *de facto* government, and yet all its acts are practically respected as much as they could be if their separate nationality had been formally admitted. Their letters of marque are regarded as valid. This involves the recognition of those who issue them as a legitimate power, foreign to that of the United States, on whose commerce they are authorized to prey. England professes perfect neutrality, to sit apart and regard this as a struggle between equals. Of this we should not much complain, if that government were really neutral. But her neutrality is very equivocal. Facilities of all kinds are granted to the Southern privateers, which are denied to our national vessels. The laws of neutrality are pushed to one extreme in their favour, and to the opposite to our disadvantage. Southern privateers are allowed to coal and refit in British ports, when our ships are forbidden by colonial governors even to take on board coal deposited by our own government. English vessels, filled with arms and other contrabands of war, are allowed to enter the harbours in the English West India Islands, transship their cargoes, receive pilots, and every other aid from British consuls, to evade the blockade of our Southern ports. An American ship is burned within sight of an English harbour by a Southern privateer; her crew carried into that harbour as prisoners of war; the privateer allowed to repair damages, increase her armament, and get ready for further depredations. The Queen's proclamation forbids English ships carrying despatches, arms, military stores, or materials, or any other article or articles, considered and deemed to be contraband of war, according to law or modern usage of nations, for the use or service of either of the contending parties; and threatens with her displeasure in case they disregard her commands. Nevertheless British officials knowingly receive the ambassadors of our revolted States, pay them, as such, the greatest deference and attention; secure for them, with their despatches, a passage on board of a British steamer, without

let or censure. In these and many other ways have the government of England, and those in authority under it, unmistakeably manifested their sympathy with the Southern rebellion. Every one knows how powerful is this moral support. The kind feeling and good wishes of England for Italy, during her recent struggle for nationality, despite the neutrality of the government, was a potent influence in deciding the conflict in her favour.

Governments, however, are of necessity cautious in their acts and utterances. The popular feeling is much more readily and clearly manifested in the public press than by official conduct. There can be no denying the fact, that the English press, metropolitan, provincial, and colonial, with few exceptions, has from the beginning been openly and cordially in favour of the rebellion. Its habitual tone has been that of disparagement, ridicule, or contempt towards the United States. Every disaster has been magnified and made matter of exultation. Every success has been depreciated; the stupendous efforts of a nation to meet an emergency such as has seldom in the history of the world taxed the energies of a people, have been ignored. When General McClellan, in August last, assumed command on the Potomac, he found the army almost disorganized by the expiration of the term of service of the troops which had been enlisted for three months. Since that time six hundred and fifty thousand men have been mustered into service, have been armed, uniformed, formed into regiments, brigades, and divisions. Not less than a thousand cannon have been provided and prepared for the field; a military line of operation from the Potomac to Kansas, of fifteen hundred miles, equivalent to a line from Madrid to Moscow, has been occupied. An immense naval armament, for the Atlantic coast and the Mississippi river, has been created, and twenty-four thousand sailors called into service. No man in modern time, except Napoleon in the famous hundred days, has accomplished a greater work than General McClellan: and the departments of the army and navy of no nation has ever shown more energy and wise efficiency than has been exhibited under our government. Is there nothing in this to secure the respect of foreign nations? It would at least shield us from contemptuous abuse,

were it not for a deep and violent feeling of hostility. We should not so entirely give up our confidence in the honour and rectitude of England towards America, if this unfriendly spirit were confined to the secular press. The last hope of justice or kind feeling died within us, when we found that leading religious papers of Great Britain were equally hostile. Dr. Campbell (in the organ of the English Congregationalists) tells us that we are fighting for an abstraction, and that we are engaged in a hopeless struggle to subjugate the South. The *Edinburgh Witness*, the organ of the Free Church of Scotland, a body to which we are bound by the most intimate ties of brotherhood, publishes and endorses slanders so atrocious as to be incredible by any mind from which God had not withdrawn the spirit of justice. These slanders are directed principally against our President, a man held in respect and affection by this whole nation. He may not be a man of polished manners or dignified presence. Englishmen, however, know better than most men, that the body is not the man. They know not only that the highest attributes may belong to a mind encased in an uncouth form, but that the blood of kings and nobles may flow through limbs of huge proportions. They have seen burly dukes, whom no stranger could distinguish either by form or carriage from a boniface. We do not claim for Mr. Lincoln the graces which a dancing-master can bestow. But we do regard him as a man of mind, of unimpeachable integrity, of unbending firmness, of kind and gentle feelings, and of genuine simplicity of character, (the true apostolic *εὐλαχρίνεα*) which promise to secure him a place in the hearts of his countrymen, second to that occupied by no president since the days of Washington. To hold up such a man as a monster, in a paper professing to be religious and to represent a great ecclesiastical organization, is a national insult and injury.

Nothing, however, so clearly demonstrates the hostile feeling of England towards this country, as the effect produced by the seizure of Messrs. Mason and Slidell on board of a British merchant steamer. The whole country burst forth in one cry of indignation. The demand for instant redress was imperious and insulting. All negotiation or diplomacy was to be repudiated. Nothing but the immediate restoration of the rebel

ambassadors, and an apology for the insufferable outrage and insult to the English flag, was to be thought of for a moment. The government sent out its imperative demand. Preparations were instantly made for war on the largest scale. All exportation of arms or warlike munitions of any kind to America, was forbidden by proclamation. Troops were ostentatiously ordered to Canada. A large naval force was collected on our coast. The press, liberal and tory, vied with each other in violence. Secession flags were exhibited in the theatre, and paraded through the streets of London. At no former period in the history of England does there appear to have been such unanimity and violence of feeling. Even the excellent Earl Shaftesbury excuses himself from appearing at a meeting appointed to pray for peace, for fear it should be inferred that the supplicants to the Prince of Peace to keep two kindred nations from shedding each other's blood, did not sympathize with the government in its hostility. What was the occasion of this violent manifestation of enmity? Simply that we had done to England what she many hundreds of times had done to us. We had stopped a British merchant vessel on the high seas, and taken from her four native born American citizens. England has always claimed the right to take her subjects wherever they could be found. This she did not assert as a belligerent right, but as her prerogative at all times, whether of war or peace. She had formally refused to renounce that right, even when our government, after the commencement of the war of 1812, tendered her peace, if she would simply agree to forbear to exercise it. Viewed, therefore, simply in the light of claiming our own citizens, however inconsistent in this view of the matter with our own principles, England had no right to complain. But this is not the proper light in which the arrest of Messrs. Mason and Slidell is to be regarded. They were not taken simply as citizens owing allegiance to this country, but as enemies, bearing commissions and carrying despatches from an organized body arrayed in arms against this country. The steamer Trent had violated the laws of nations, and the proclamation of the British Queen, in becoming the carrier of those gentlemen on a mission hostile to the United States. No English lawyer has ventured to

assert that she was not justly liable to seizure and forfeiture. The only error charged by the law officers of the crown, is that Captain Wilkes, by whom the seizure was made, did not take the vessel into port, and have the forfeiture judicially decided. In this, it is admitted, he erred. He violated a principle which our government has ever asserted. We always protested against the justice of permitting any subaltern to adjudicate on the spot, on the nationality and allegiance of men found on board of American ships.

As to this whole matter, the points of agreement and disagreement between us and England are, 1. She claims the right of searching neutral vessels in time of peace. This we deny. 2. Both parties admit the right of search in the time of war. That is, they admit that when one nation is at war with another, no neutral power is entitled to aid either party; and that when there is reason to suspect that a neutral vessel is engaged in such hostile act, she is liable to search and seizure. 3. It is also agreed that carrying for an enemy any person or thing contraband of war is an act of hostility. 4. That not only military officers, soldiers, sailors, and munitions of war, but also despatches are contraband; and, according to Sir William Scott, and to reason and justice, civil officers on a hostile mission are to be included in the list. 5. It is conceded that the captain of the Trent did receive and engage to transport to England, Messrs. Mason and Slidell, knowing them to be ambassadors and bearers of despatches, in direct violation of national law, and of the Queen's proclamation, and, therefore, that his vessel was justly liable not only to search, but to confiscation. 6. That Captain Wilkes erred in not bringing the Trent into port for judicial decision. This last is the only ground for complaint that England has in the case. And this complaint, though valid in itself, she had no right to make, because she had so often taken sailors from our ships without adjudication, and in other instances had assumed the right of this peremptory action. After the battle of Waterloo, it was taken for granted that Napoleon would endeavour to make his escape to America. The English Admiralty, therefore, issued orders to the British cruisers to search every American vessel they should encounter, and to

take the person of Napoleon into custody wherever found. The American ship *Virginia*, sailing from a port in France at that time, was thus overhauled and searched throughout, with the avowed purpose of taking their enemy from under the protection of the American flag. Whatever, therefore, may be thought of the principle, no candid man can refuse to admit, that England was fairly estopped by her antecedents from making Captain Wilkes's mistake a ground of complaint. But even if she has arrived at the conclusion that she formerly did wrong, and has formed the purpose to be more tender of the rights of neutrals in the future, the error of the American captain was too small to account for subsequent events. His offence was not that he fired a shot before the bows of the *Trent*; nor that the *Trent* was innocent of any violation of neutrality; but simply that Captain Wilkes, from the most disinterested and benevolent motives, abstained from taking his prize into port. This, and this only, as charged by the law officers of England, was the head and front of his offending. Did this throw a great nation into a frenzy of indignation? Was it for this a Christian people seized their arms, and shouted to a kindred people, "To your knees, or die!"? The cause is altogether disproportioned to the effect. When an engineer raises the valve of an overcharged boiler, the opening of the valve is not the cause of the violent outrush of steam. It is but the occasion. It is not less evident that the affair of the *Trent* was not the cause, but the occasion, of the outbreak of wrath which shook all England. Had there been no pent up spirit of enmity, that affair had been as little regarded as the lifting the valve of an empty boiler.

We deeply regret the conduct of England towards this country in this the time of our national trial, because it must produce permanent alienation; alienation arising from a sense of a grievous injury unrighteously inflicted, and alienation arising from a loss of confidence in the honour and sincerity of the English people. That the most vehement abolitionists should take part heart and hand with a rebellion, the object of which is to perpetuate and extend slavery, is an offence which no ignorance, real or pretended, can explain or justify. It shocks the moral sense of the world. England stands before the

nations as a people willing and anxious to sacrifice their conscience to their interests and jealousies. We do not write this under the impulse of hostile feelings to England, much less from any desire to increase the sense of wrong and the consequent resentment which are now so strongly felt by all Americans. We have some readers in Great Britain. It is for them we write. We wish to convince them that they have done, and are doing us a grievous wrong, and that they have given the whole weight of their influence to an evil cause. They have joined the wrong against the right. They have come out as the great upholders and patrons of the perpetuity and extension of slavery. It is with a view of producing this conviction, that in the foregoing pages we presented the evidence that England, of course with many and honourable exceptions, does sympathize with this southern rebellion, and we proceed now, in few words, to show that in so doing they sympathize with evil, with an unrighteous effort to establish a government whose cornerstone is domestic slavery.

It would be difficult, should we fill a volume, to present a tithe of the evidence on this subject. In the course of a few pages, however, enough may be said to produce conviction in every impartial mind. In the first place, it should create some misgiving that England stands alone in this matter. The other governments of Europe, more or less decidedly manifest their sympathy with the United States in this great struggle. There are interested classes in France, and elsewhere, who take the opposite side. But, as a general remark, what we have said is true. We dread nothing, except from England. Especially do Christians on the continent of Europe appreciate the true cause of this conflict, and give us their hearty sympathy. When the President of the United States appointed a national fast, we received the gratifying assurance that they would, and afterwards that they did, unite with us in the observance of that solemnity. When the Evangelical Alliance met, during the past summer, at Geneva, that body adopted a series of resolutions expressing the warmest interest in our behalf. Count Gasparin, the noble representative of the mind and heart of the friends of Christ in Europe, published, so early as last spring, when this rebellion had scarcely raised its

hydra head, a book which seemed to glow with the holy fire of inspiration. It filled American Christians with wonder and delight that God had given to his children abroad such just and elevated views of this great crisis in the world's history. This rebellion is a world event. On its suppression or success depends far more than the fate of this one nation. Count Gasparin wrote, just after the Cotton States had formed their Confederacy, and while Virginia and the other border states were trembling in the balance. Even then, however, he took in the true nature and vast proportions of the coming struggle. "Never," he says, "was a more obstinate and more colossal strife commenced on earth." That he understood the nature of the rebellion, is abundantly evident. "It is one thing," he says, "to hold slaves; it is another to be founded expressly to serve the cause of slavery upon earth; this is a new fact in the history of mankind. If a Southern Confederacy should ever take rank among nations, it will represent slavery, and nothing else. I am wrong; it will also represent the African slave trade, and the fillibustering system. In any case, the Southern Confederacy will be so far identified with slavery, with its progress, with the measures designed to propagate it here below, that a chain and whip seem to be the only devices to be embroidered on its flag." P. 125. "One cannot, with impunity, give full scope to his imagination, and, in the year of our Lord, 1861, set to work to contrive the plan of a confederacy designed to protect and propagate slavery. These things will be avenged sooner or later. Ah! if the South know how it is that it should not succeed, if it comprehended that the North has been hitherto its great, its only guarantee!" P. 148. The anticipations entertained by the authors of this great rebellion, he thus depicts. "Nothing could be more imposing, in fact, if they had the least chance of success. The fifteen Southern States, already immense, joined to Mexico, Cuba, and Central America, what a power this would be! And doubtless this power would not stop at the Isthmus of Panama: it would be no more difficult to reëstablish slavery in Bolivia, on the equator, and in Peru, than in Mexico. Thus the patriarchal institution would advance to rejoin Brazil, and the dismayed eye would not find a single free spot upon which to rest between Delaware Bay

and the banks of the Uruguay. Furthermore, this colossal negro jail would be stocked by a no less colossal slave-trade; baracoons would be refilled in Africa, slave expeditions would be organized on a scale hitherto unknown, and whole squadrons of slave-ships (those 'floating hells,') would transport their cargoes under the Southern colours, proudly unfurled; patriotic indignation would be aroused at the mere name of the right of search, and the whole world would be challenged to defend the liberty of the seas."

The author is not unaware that the Southern leaders have repudiated the idea of reëstablishing the African slave-trade. As to that point, however, he says: "Each one feels instinctively that no part of the plan can be separated from the whole; that it must be great to be respected; that to people this vast extent with slaves, the African slave-trade is indispensable; of course they took care not to avow all this at the first moment; it was necessary, in the beginning, to delude others, and perhaps themselves; it was necessary to obtain recognition. On this account the prudent politicians, who have just drawn up the programme of the South, have been careful to record in it the prohibition of the African slave-trade, and the disavowal of the plans of conquest. But this does not prevent the necessities of the position from becoming known by and by. True programmes, adapted to the position of affairs, are not changed from day to day. I defy the slave States, provided their confederation succeeds in existing, to do otherwise than seek to extend towards the south; hemmed in on all sides by liberty, incessantly provoked by the impossibility of preventing the flight of their negroes, they will fall on those of their neighbours who are the least capable of resisting, and whose territories are most to their convenience. This fact is obvious, as it is also obvious that they will have recourse to the African slave-trade to people their new possessions. It is in vain to deny it, on account of Europe or of the border States; the necessities will subsist, and sooner or later they will be obeyed. If the border States persist in deluding themselves on this point, and fancy that they will always keep the monopoly of this infamous supply of negroes, sold at enor-

mous prices, this concerns them. In any case, the illusion will finally become dispelled." P. 121—3.

Taking such just and comprehensive views of the nature and designs of the new confederacy, Count Gasparin, as a philanthropist and a Christian, gives his hearty support to the United States. He fully appreciates the justice and greatness of their cause, as well as its difficulties and dangers. "I have not sought," he says, "to recount events, but to attempt a study, which I believe to be useful to us, and which may also not be useless to the United States. We owe them the support of our sympathy. It is more important than people imagine, to let them hear words of encouragement from us at this decisive moment." "The American people are now striving to rise. Enterprise as difficult as glorious. Whatever may be the issue of the first conflict, just about to be decided, this will be only the first conflict. There will be many others; the uprising of a great people is not the work of a day." "In wishing the final triumph of the North, we wish the salvation of the North and of the South, their common greatness, and their lasting prosperity." He shows, moreover, that he has soul enough to appreciate the character of the man, whom English and Scotch journalists, secular and religious, would hold up to execration. "If," says Count Gasparin, "you wish to know what the presidency of Mr. Lincoln will be in the end, see in what manner and under what auspices it was inaugurated; listen to the words that fell from the lips of the new president as he quitted his native town. 'The task which devolves upon me is greater, perhaps, than that which has devolved on any other man since the days of Washington. I hope that you, my friends, will all pray that I may receive that assistance from on high, without which I cannot succeed, but with which, success is certain.' 'Yes, yes; we will pray for you!' Such was the response of the inhabitants of Springfield, who weeping, and with uncovered heads, witnessed the departure of their fellow-citizen. What a *debut* for a government! Have there been many inaugurations here below of such thrilling solemnity? Do uniforms and plumes, the roar of cannon, triumphal arches, and vague appeals to Providence, equal these simple words: 'Pray for me!' 'We

will pray for you!' Ah! courage, Lincoln! the friends of freedom and of America are with you. Courage! you hold in your hands the destinies of a great principle, and a great people. Courage! you have to resist your friends, and to face your foes; it is the fate of all who seek to do good on earth. Courage! you will have need of it to-morrow, in a year, to the end; you will have need of it in peace and in war; you will have need of it to avert the compromise in peace or war of that noble progress which it is your charge to accomplish, more than in conquest of slavery. Courage! your *rôle*, as you have said, may be inferior to no other, not even to that of Washington; to raise up the United States will not be less glorious than to have founded them." We thank God for these noble words.

The French Christian philanthropist, in entering so intelligently into the true character of our present struggle, seems to have been prescient of danger to this holy cause from England. To her he says: "Let England beware! it were better for her to lose Malta, Corfu, and Gibraltar, than the glorious position which her struggle against slavery and the slave-trade has secured her in the esteem of nations. Even in our age of armed frigates and rifled cannon, the chief of all powers, thank God, is moral power. Woe to the nation that disregards it, and consents to immolate its principles to its interests! From the beginning of the present conflict, the enemies of England, and they are numerous, have predicted that the cause of cotton will weigh heavier in her scales than the cause of justice and liberty. They are preparing to judge her by her conduct in the American crisis. Once more, let her beware!"

That European Christians, free from perverting influences, take this just and elevated view of our national conflict, ought of itself to lead Christians in England to doubt the righteousness of their hostility to a cause which appears so worthy of support to God's people elsewhere. But, in the second place, that the rebellion with which we are now contending is made in the interests of slavery, is apparent from the fact that only the slave states take part in it, and that hostility to the general government is in exact proportion to the predominance of slavery within their own borders. The slave states are divided

into classes, differing from each other in their productions, in the character of the people, as well as in climate. In those producing cotton, rice, and sugar, the number of slaves is far greater in proportion to the whites than in those further north. It was in the Gulf, or cotton region, that secession had its origin. Those states separated from the Union and formed a confederacy before any of the other class joined in the revolt. It was long doubtful whether any of the farming slave states would take part with the extreme South. There was an overwhelming majority against secession and in favour of the Union, in North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Delaware, and Maryland. Of these states, the four last named remain in the Union, and are contributing their quota of men and money to uphold the federal cause. In the three former, (Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee,) the sympathizers with the South were able to carry their states into the Southern Confederacy; not, however, on the issue of secession, but in opposition to coercion. When the cotton states separated from the Union, Mr. Lincoln, in his inaugural address, assured them that he did not contemplate waging war against them, or employing the forces of the United States to coerce them into submission. He simply avowed that, in obedience to his oath to support the Constitution, he should take measures to collect the duties on foreign importations, and assert the right of the Union to the possession and safe-keeping of the public property. In this posture things remained in abeyance until the bombardment of Fort Sumter. This was regarded as an act of open hostility. The President immediately issued his proclamation calling for seventy-five thousand volunteers, not to make war on the South, but to carry into effect the purposes avowed in his inaugural address. This was denounced by the South as coercion. The *esprit de corps* which pervades the slave states, was so roused as to carry the three states already mentioned over to the confederacy. The simple fact, therefore, that this rebellion is confined to the slave states, and that it had its origin in those states in which the slave interest is altogether predominant, and that only a minority of the border states have been induced to join it, is decisive evidence of its being made in the interests of slavery.

Thirdly, the whole history of the country and of the present controversy, precludes all doubt on this subject. There are in the United States not far from four millions of slaves. There are about three hundred and fifty thousand slave owners, who, with their families, make about two millions of persons directly interested in this kind of property. To these slave owners a very large proportion of the land, especially in the cotton states, belongs. The annual product of this vast amount of slave labour, in cotton, rice, sugar, and tobacco, is to be counted by hundreds of millions. The slave interest, therefore, viewed in its material aspect, is immense. The influence belonging to such a number of persons, and to such an amount of property, must be exceedingly great. Slave property, moreover, is, from its nature, peculiarly sensitive. It is felt to be precarious. There is the danger of insurrections, of escape, of interference from hostile influence. It therefore requires to be specially guarded. Stringent laws are made for its security. Everything which tends to render the slaves discontented, is resisted as a deadly evil. The discussion of the lawfulness or of the evils of slavery becomes a real danger; and those known to be adverse to the institution are regarded as enemies. It is further evident that these slave owners, having peculiar interests and being under peculiar influences, form a distinct and intimately associated class. It is said that the hay-crop in this country exceeds in value the cotton crop. But the hay growers do not form a distinct class in society; neither do manufacturers, nor merchants, in the same sense or to the same extent, as do the slave owners. The latter, therefore, act together in any great political movement. Their property being thus peculiar, and the rightfulness of their tenure, and especially the wisdom and justice of perpetuating the institution being a matter vehemently doubted and debated, it has become an axiom with them that slave owners are never safe in any community unless they have the controlling power. This is true, provided the community have the legal right, as well as the power, to legislate on the subject.

Slavery has been abolished in the dependencies of France and England, because the slaveholders were the minority. It has in like manner disappeared from all the states of this

Union, where non-slaveholders were in the ascendency. Under the Constitution of the United States, which prohibits all interference by the general government in the municipal affairs of the several states, slavery was secure. But this, many of the Southern planters were slow to believe. They were afraid to trust to the guaranties of the Constitution, and therefore, as long at least as thirty years ago, it was said by representative men, that as soon as the South ceased to control the Union, it must set up for itself. For the last twenty years, disunion has been on this ground openly advocated, and skilful and persistent efforts have been constantly made to bring the public mind at the South to this conclusion. The South, up to the election of Mr. Lincoln, has controlled the Union. Of this there is no doubt, and it is often boastfully asserted as proof of the inherent superiority of the South to the North. Although less than a third of the free population of the country, and possessing less than a third of its wealth, it has had eleven presidents out of sixteen; seventeen judges of the Supreme Court out of twenty-eight; fourteen attorney-generals out of nineteen; sixty-one presidents of the Senate out of seventy-seven; twenty-one speakers of the House of Representatives out of thirty-three; eighty foreign ministers out of one hundred and thirty-four. The like disparity runs throughout all the officers of the general government. Nothing can more clearly evince the dominance of the slave power in the councils of the nation. Our foreign and domestic policy has been in like subjection to Southern influence. There is nothing surprising or abnormal in this. The slaveholders, although a minority, have always held the balance of power. Of two contending candidates, he was sure to succeed who could secure the Southern vote. Everything, therefore, was promised and given to obtain that support. Besides this, the slave power has not only been thus the arbiter in all struggles for place or influence, but it has always threatened disunion, if it was not satisfied in its demands. Disunion and its consequences have ever been regarded as the most dire of national calamities. To avoid it, the North were willing to submit to everything. To this day, Northern men would have gladly allowed the South to have every president, two-thirds of all offices of trust and power, to

control our commercial relations at her pleasure, and to have her own way in everything, rather than risk the destruction of our national unity and life.

The South has always been treated as a spoilt child, to which the other members of the family gave up for the sake of peace. It was not until her demands touched the conscience of the North, that a stop was put to concession. If she loved slavery, she might take what measures she saw fit to cherish and perpetuate it. But when she demanded, as the condition of her continuance in the Union, that the nation, as a nation, should love it, should legalize and extend it; that every foot of the territory of the United States, so long as it remained under the control of the general government, should be slave territory; that the area of slavery should advance whenever and wherever the nation enlarged its boundaries, then the reason, heart, and conscience of the North said, No!—you may hold slaves, if you please, but you shall not make slaveholders of us. This was the cause of disunion. It was the determination of the South to convert all the territories (as distinguished from the states) into slave territory, and to require the enactment of slave laws by the general government, that led to the refusal of the North to make further concessions to the slave power.

Our English friends may not at once understand this. A few words may render it intelligible. From the foundation of our government until a very recent period, slavery was admitted by the North and the South, as by all other nations, to be a municipal institution, depending for its existence upon the *lex loci*. This principle has been recognised by numerous decisions, as well of the federal as of the state courts, and by those of the slave states as frequently as by those of the free states. From this principle it follows, that if a master takes his slave into a free state, to England, Canada, New York, Pennsylvania, or anywhere else where slavery is not by law established, he loses all legal control over him. The slave thereby becomes free. It follows, also, or rather it is included in what has been said, that if the United States possessed or acquired territory in which slavery did not already exist, slaveholders, although free to take any species of property which other men may take into such territories, could have no

security therein for their slave property. It was also held by all parties, that the general government, having sole legislative control over the territories not yet formed into states, had the right to establish or to prohibit therein slavery at their discretion. This power Congress exercised on repeated occasions, with the concurrence and coöperation of the Southern senators and representatives. As the operation of this principle was likely to exclude slavery from the new territories, and prevent slaveholders from having, as they regarded it, an equal interest in the common property of the nation, various expedients were adopted to satisfy their demands. In 1820 it was enacted, in the famous Missouri Compromise, that slavery should be for ever prohibited north of latitude $36^{\circ} 30'$, and not prohibited south of that line. This law was passed by Southern votes and influences. Next the principle was adopted, that the people living in any territory might establish or prohibit slavery, as they saw fit, but that Congress should not interfere one way or the other. This is what, in Western phraseology, was called the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty." This also, for a while, secured the earnest support of the majority of Southern statesmen. Soon, however, it was found that this would not answer their purpose. Northern emigrants to the unoccupied lands of the West, were likely greatly to outnumber those from the South; if, therefore, it were to be left to the inhabitants of the territories to determine their destiny, they would in most instances inevitably become free. This led to the adoption of the principle, that neither Congress nor the territorial legislatures had the right to prohibit slavery in any of the territories of the United States; that Southern planters had the right to carry their slaves wherever Northern farmers could lawfully take their horses; and that as Congress enacted laws for the protection of all other kinds of property in the territories, it was bound to pass laws for the like security of property in slaves. As this converts all the territories of the United States into slaveholding communities, and devolves on the general government the duty of establishing slavery wherever the Constitution bears sway outside of the established free states, and assumes that whenever new territory shall be acquired, whether by purchase or conquest, whether North or

South, it shall be instanter transformed into slave territory, by the mere action of the Constitution, it proved to be more than the yielding North could bear. Mr. Lincoln was elected on a platform which repudiated this new doctrine, and asserted what had been the faith of the founders of our government, and of all our illustrious statesmen, viz. that slavery has no right to exist where the *lex loci* does not expressly create or recognise it. His election was the signal for revolt. It was held to decide the question that the North would not grant the South her new discovered right of carrying slavery wherever the Constitution of the United States was in force. Although the illustrious Henry Clay had long since declared, that no power on earth should ever force him to vote for the introduction of slavery into any territory where it did not previously exist; and although even Jefferson Davis, now president of the new confederacy, had himself, as senator, voted for the prohibition of slavery by Congress, yet as an occasion for disunion was all that was desired, Mr. Lincoln's election was hailed with public rejoicing in Charleston, and steps were immediately taken to carry into effect the long-cherished plans of disunion. It is thus apparent that the preservation and extension of slavery is the sole object of this rebellion, so far as it dares to be avowed.

It may be true, and doubtless is true, as the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, who for a long time nobly resisted the movement, that the chief instigators of this revolt were actuated by disappointed ambition, but this does not affect the character of the rebellion as a whole. Its avowed object, that which was presented in order to arouse and secure the coöperation of the slave states, was the security and extension of slavery. In the ordinance of secession passed by South Carolina, the only reason presented to justify her, in the sight of heaven and earth, for breaking up the Union of these States, is that slavery was endangered. It complains that for twenty-five years a system of agitation had been in operation against slavery, that at last it had secured the aid of the common government in the election of "a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery;" and that the South was to be excluded from the

common territory. It was for slavery, and for nothing else, South Carolina seceded. The speech of Mr. Stephens, after his election to the vice-presidency of the new Confederacy, gives the fullest and most explicit exposition of the design and principles of the confederates. "The new constitution has put at rest for ever," he says, "all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution—African slavery, as it exists among us—the proper status of the negro in our form of civilization. This was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution. Jefferson, in his forecast, had anticipated this as 'the rock on which the old Union would split.' He was right. What was conjecture with him, is now a realized fact." After referring to the fact that Jefferson, and other statesmen of that day, believed not "the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically," he goes on to say, "Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error. It was a sandy foundation, and the idea of a government built upon it, when the storm came and the wind blew, it fell. Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and moral condition. This, our new government, is the first in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth." Anti-slavery men, he says, are fanatics, because they assume "that the negro is equal, and hence is entitled to equal privileges and rights with the white man. If the premises were correct, their conclusions would be logical and just; but their premises being wrong, their whole argument fails." We cannot stop to remark on this as a specimen of logic. Because, as now found in the South, the negro is not equal to the white man, therefore he must be doomed to perpetual slavery, is the argument. But unless he is so inferior as to be for ever incapable of freedom, he cannot justly be permanently enslaved. Two things are falsely assumed against the negro; first, that his inferiority is so great that his normal condition in relation to a white man is that of a slave; and that

his inferiority is inherent and unalterable. The logic of the Turk is as sound as that of Mr. Stephens; women are inferior to men, therefore they should for ever be slaves. We are not, however, to be turned aside to show the atrocity of the principle on which the new Confederacy is founded. Our object is simply to show what that principle is, by Southern statesmen, avowed to be. It is not for us, says Mr. Stephens, to question God's ordinances. He has made one race inferior to another. "Our Confederacy," he tells the world, "is founded upon principles in strict conformity with these laws. This stone, which was rejected by the first builders, is become the chief stone of the corner in our new edifice." This is the edifice which anti-slavery England is aiding to raise, and for the sake of which she seems willing to shed rivers of blood. Surely God must have given her up to delusion.

To Americans, it is no more necessary to prove that this Southern rebellion is made in the interest of slavery, than it is to prove that charcoal is black. We are writing, however, for those whose interest it is to deny it; who must deny it, to shield themselves from self-contempt and self-reprobation. This denial, however, being made in face of facts patent to the whole world, can avail them little. If it saves them, for the moment, from self-condemnation, it cannot save them from the condemnation of the world. We shall advert to only one other source of proof on this subject. The nature of a disease may often be determined by the nature of the remedies. So the character of the struggle which now rends our unhappy country, can be learned from the means proposed, first to prevent, and afterwards to arrest it. These means had reference to one object from first to last; and that object was to satisfy the demands of the South in relation to slavery. This collision has been long foreseen, or at least apprehended. The framers of our Constitution thought they gave every reasonable security to the South, by providing, first, that while in all other states population was to be the basis of representation, in the South three-fifths of the slaves, although held as property, should be represented. This rule gives the South nineteen or twenty more representatives in Congress than it would be entitled to on the basis of its white population. Secondly, by withholding all

authority from the federal government to interfere with slavery in any form within the limits of the several states; and, thirdly, by the provision for the rendition of fugitives from service.

There is another feature of our Constitution, which, although not intended for the exclusive benefit of the South, has worked very much in its favour. The Senate of the United States is composed of two senators from each state, without regard to its extent of territory, to its population, or its wealth. The slave states, although having but little more than one-third of the white population of the country, had thirty senators, and the free states thirty-two. These are the constitutional provisions for the security of slavery; but they did not satisfy the South. The slaveholders, through their representative men, urged that it was not enough that the general government had not the right to abolish slavery, but the security of that institution required that it should not have the power to do it. To secure this end, it was urged that whenever a free state was admitted to the Union, it should be balanced by the admission of a new slave state; so that in the Senate, at least, the equality should be preserved. Another plan, first proposed by Mr. Calhoun, and urged last winter by Senator Hunter, of Virginia, was to alter the Constitution, so as to provide for the election of two presidents, one from the slave and the other from the free states, whose joint signatures should be requisite to the validity of any act of Congress. The exorbitancy of these demands is not perceived, if we have in our mind the whole South as territorially a moiety of the Union. We must remember that these demands had for their object to secure for three hundred and fifty thousand slave-owners, and their immediate dependents, equal power to the residue of the thirty millions of our people. Southern writers say, that in all these controversies, a Southerner is a slaveholder. This is his distinctive characteristic. And, of course, if a man is not a slaveholder, he is not a Southerner, and is not to be so regarded, no matter where he lives. In point of fact, the non-slaveholding whites of the South, although outnumbering the slaveholders three or four times over, are never taken into account. Their interests, and even their existence, are ignored.

After the secession movement had actually begun, all the efforts to arrest its progress had exclusive reference to slavery. First, the resolution was unanimously adopted by Congress, declaring that the general government had no right to interfere with slavery within the several states. The president and every department of the government gave every assurance that all the guaranties of the Constitution should be faithfully observed. Secondly, Senator Crittenden proposed that slavery should be for ever prohibited in the territories north of latitude $36^{\circ} 30'$, and legally established in all territories now possessed, or to be hereafter acquired by the United States, south of that latitude. Thirdly, what is called the border state proposition, was, that slavery should be prohibited north of $36^{\circ} 30'$, and not prohibited south of that line; its establishment or non-establishment being left for future decision. Fourthly, Mr. Adams, now our minister at the court of St. James, introduced a bill proposing to erect all our territory into separate states, with or without slavery. Those territories which had already admitted slavery, would constitute slave states; and those which had not, would constitute free states. It is not our object to discuss the merits of either of these plans, but simply to call attention to the fact, that they all had reference to slavery. That was the only subject in controversy. It is therefore undeniable, that the perpetuity and extension of slavery was the object of the rebellion, which these compromises were designed to prevent or to arrest.

Having thus proved that this is a pro-slavery rebellion, we propose to show, in few words, that it is altogether unjustifiable, and that it has been consummated by the grossest acts of treachery and spoliation. The leaders of the enterprise, indeed, assumed the ground that no justification is necessary. The several states, they say, entered the Union at their own free will, and are at liberty to leave it when they please. It is enough to say in reference to this view of our federal Constitution, that it was universally rejected, north and south, until within the last twenty or thirty years; and since that period it has been advocated only by a set of extreme political theorists. It is intrinsically absurd. Who can believe that a government would give fifteen millions of dollars for Louisiana,

ten millions for Texas, five millions for Florida, if those states would within a week declare themselves out of the Union? Well does Count Gasparin say—"Never yet existed on earth a federal compact conceived in this wise—The states which form a part of this league will remain in it only till it pleases them to leave it. Such, notwithstanding, is the formula on which the Southern theorists make a stand. Among the anarchical doctrines that our age has seen hatched (and they are numerous,) this seems to me worthy of occupying the place of honour. This right of separation is simply the *liberum veto*, resuscitated for the benefit of federal institutions. As in the horseback Diets of Poland, a single opposing vote could put a stop to everything, so that it only remained to vote by sabrestrokes, so confederations, recognising the right of separation, would have no other resort than brute force; for no great nation can allow itself to be killed without defending itself." (P. 108.)

The leaders of this movement, of course, advance certain reasons to vindicate the exercise of their assumed right to break up this government. They say that the compact has been violated; that fugitive slaves have not been restored, agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution; and that the Constitution itself was virtually annulled by the election of Mr. Lincoln. The complaint about the non-rendition of fugitive slaves is a mere pretext. The cotton, or Gulf states, are so far removed from the Northern frontiers that they suffered little or nothing from that source. Besides, the general government has ever been faithful to the constitutional compact in this regard. Congress not only enacted a stringent fugitive slave law, but every department of the government, judicial and executive, was strenuous in carrying it into effect. The Hon. Mr. Douglas once said in his place in the Senate, that for one fugitive slave liberated by illegal action at the North, he could adduce the case of ten northern freemen outraged at the South. As to the abrogation of the Constitution by the election of Mr. Lincoln, it can only mean, that the interpretation of the Constitution given by the extreme South was repudiated by those who voted for that gentleman. But when it is remembered that no sentiment has been uttered by

Mr. Lincoln, as President, which he does not hold in common with Washington, Jefferson, and other founders of our Constitution, it is obvious that this plea is almost devoid of meaning. It is plain that the South has no oppression to complain of. She has always had more than her due share in the representation, and in the executive authority of the country. No act of Congress, of any political importance, has ever been passed without the concurrence of Southern men. The South has prospered—has increased in population, wealth, and power, under the beneficent operation of the national government. Slaveholders have rebelled, not on account of the past, but for the sake of the future. To realize their scheme of a vast empire founded on slavery, they have not hesitated to endeavour to overthrow a government which they had sworn to support, and involve the nation in all the horrors of a civil war.

This rebellion, thus without any just provocation, was inaugurated by treachery and spoliation. Members of the cabinet, of the Senate, and of the House of Representatives, under their official oaths to support the Constitution of the country, and while receiving its pay, were plotting its overthrow. Mr. Floyd, Secretary of War, in an address to the people at Richmond, stated that General Scott, as early as September 1860, presented to the administration of Mr. Buchanan a programme for the arming and garrisoning the Southern forts, which, if carried out, would have rendered secession impossible. It was his boast, his claim to Southern gratitude, that he had prevented the adoption of that plan. The Southern forts, therefore, were designedly left unarmed and unoccupied, in order that they might fall an easy prey to the seceding states. Immense quantities of arms, and other munitions of war, were transferred to the South, in order that it might be prepared for rebellion. All such munitions, and the arsenals, mints, and other public property, were seized and appropriated, even in many cases before the acts of secession were passed. Officers in the navy and army, high in rank, threw up their commissions, and, wherever possible, surrendered the troops under their command, and the public property at their control, to the rebel authorities. Mercantile debts, to the amount of three hundred millions of dol-

lars, owed by Southern to Northern merchants, have been cancelled; all stocks of the several seceding states held by men faithful to the Union have been forfeited. Such is the character of the rebellion which England, and, as it would seem, the English people, are disposed to aid by every means in their power.

Englishmen tell us that this is a struggle for power; that the North is endeavouring to subjugate the South; or that, at the best, we are fighting for an abstraction. It is plain, however, from the preceding statement, that we are fighting for our national existence; that the avowed object of the war, that is, formally and authoritatively by Congress and the President, is simply to uphold the Constitution in its integrity, and in its legitimate authority. In the accomplishment of this object, not only our national honour, our name and place among the nations of the earth, the free and normal development of our institutions, but the most important material interests of the country are at stake. It is almost physically impossible that this country should be divided. The mouths of the Mississippi must be in the possession of the millions who dwell upon its banks. To secure that object the nation gladly paid fifteen millions of dollars, and it cannot now be relinquished. In order to secure the port of Pensacola, and the harbour at Key West, five millions were paid for Florida, and nearly a hundred millions expended in her Indian wars, and for the navy yards and fortifications. It is impossible that the nation should give up these points, essential to the security of its commerce. In short, it might as well be said that England would be fighting for an abstraction, should she refuse to submit without a struggle to the secession of Scotland and Ireland from the British crown, and their erection into independent and hostile governments.

But, it is said, admitting the war to be a righteous one, it is nevertheless hopeless. Disunion is a fact accomplished. The North can never conquer the South. Eleven millions of people, we are told by English Christians, can never be subjugated. That may be very true. But, in the first place, there are not eleven millions to be subjugated. And, in the second place, subjugation is not the object aimed at. Eleven

millions is the whole number of the population of the fifteen slave states. From this are to be deducted, first, four million five hundred thousand slaves, and free coloured people; and, secondly, two million five hundred thousand white population of the border states, which have not joined the rebellion. This reduces the number of our antagonists to something like five millions instead of eleven. Still further reduction is to be made on account of the vast numbers of Union-men scattered through the Confederate States. The great mistake, however, of these English writers, is the assumption that the object of the general government is the subjugation of the four or five millions of people. It is not subjugation, but the deliverance of the seceding states themselves from the domination of a tyrannical minority. When the Independents under Cromwell overthrew the British monarchy, the mass of the people were quiescent, and submitted to the authority of the Protector. The English people were not subjugated when the appearance of General Monk's army emboldened them to throw off the bonds of the new government, and to return to their allegiance to the house of Stuart. Neither will the South be subjugated, when the advance of the Federal armies enable the people to emancipate themselves from the dominion of the slaveholders, and to resume their wonted place in the American Union.

It is a great error to assume that the white population of the South is either homogeneous or unanimous. There is, indeed, a very great difference between the different slave states. No one would think of comparing the civilization, or condition of society, in Virginia, with that which exists in the Southwest—especially in Texas and Arkansas. The cotton states are the only real seceding states. In them, the population is divided into three classes: first, the slaveholders; secondly, the poor whites; and thirdly, the free whites inhabiting the mountainous districts, where there is little or nothing of slave labour, and where free labour is not considered a disgrace. These are true freemen of the mountaineer type. It is the slaveholders, who are a small minority of the population, by whom, and for whose sake this rebellion has been made. Not even all of this class approved of the measure. Many of them regarded it as insane and suicidal. Alexander

H. Stephens, the most honoured statesman of the South, long and strenuously resisted it. We have heard from the lips of men born and educated at the South, and owning large numbers of slaves, the severest condemnation of secession and disunion. The Southern papers contained lamentations and threats directed against the *rich*, as a class, for holding back from the rebellion, through fear of losing their money. As a body, however, there is no doubt that the slaveholders in the cotton states earnestly desire independence. As to the numerous class called "poor whites," they are poor in every respect; poor in property, in education, and in influence. Mr. William Gregg, in an address delivered before the South Carolina Institute, in 1851, estimated the number of white people in that state "who ought to work, and who do not, or who are so employed as to be wholly unproductive to the state, at one hundred and twenty thousand." These people, he says, are "wholly neglected, and are suffered to while away an existence but one step in advance of the Indian of the forest." There are not much more than three hundred thousand white people in South Carolina, and of these, we are told, that nearly one-half are in a state of ignorance, want, and barbarism, little above that of savages! Does any other civilized state in Christendom exhibit such a condition of its people! This is proud South Carolina! These poor whites, nevertheless, are great advocates of slavery. They are free, and therefore they are above the negro. It is their only distinction. They can easily be roused, therefore, to oppose what they are told is abolitionism, and to support a pro-slavery government. Nevertheless, they are, and are felt to be, a dangerous class. When evil comes, when fears are entertained of servile insurrections, and these poor whites are called upon to patrol the country, to keep guard over their own cabins as well as over the mansions of the planters, then they ask themselves the question—why they should thus watch, and thus tremble for their own lives and those of their families, to uphold a system which makes the few rich and the many poor. This we have heard from men who were born and passed their whole lives at the South. It is not, however, a matter to be wondered at, that the slave-owners, as a class, have supreme control, and have been able

for the time to enlist the whole resources of the country in their support. This unanimity is, however, merely superficial. In no one of the cotton states did the leaders venture to submit the question of secession to a popular vote. They dreaded the opposition of the non-slaveholding majorities. It is on those majorities the government rely for the restoration of the Union. It is not subjugation, but emancipation of the people from a selfish and tyrannical minority, this great war is intended to accomplish.

Should the prediction, however, of our English kinsmen be accomplished; should this Union be dismembered, and the Southern Confederacy, whose corner-stone is slavery, establish its independence, what will be the result? Nothing but Omniscience can answer that question. But what is the dream which the leaders in this rebellion hope to realize? It is the establishment of an empire, in which capital shall own labour; in which one race shall have all wealth and power, and the other shall be slaves—not for a time, or during a transition state, but permanently, as the best organization of society. This state of civilization, involving of necessity the barbarism, ignorance, degradation, and misery of the majority of the people, is not only to be perpetuated, but indefinitely extended. For this end, this glorious Union—founded by God, as all good people hoped and believed, to be the home of the free, the refuge of the oppressed, the instrument in his hand for the dissemination of Christianity and civil liberty throughout the world—is to be overturned.

We earnestly pray that England may be saved from the guilt of favouring such a cause. Sure we are, that if she, or any other foreign nation, should openly take part with this rebellion, it will excite the millions of the North to ungovernable frenzy, and produce a scene of desolation, over which men and angels may well weep.

71.2009.084.08961

ACCURATE AND LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS
OF THE
MEN OF THE TIME.

We are now publishing a series of unique and life-like Portraits of the Distinguished Men of the Time—embracing Military and Naval Officers, Members of Congress, Civilians, &c. They are fine line engravings, executed in superior style, and prepared from the latest Photographs, many of which have been obtained expressly for this Collection. Being printed on cards of the same size as the “Cartes de Visites,” they are adapted to the Photograph Albums, or can be sent to distant friends by mail.

These Portraits are superior to any now in the market, and are remarkable for the faithfulness with which the likeness is portrayed. When purchasing, be careful to inquire for

MARTIEN'S CARD PORTRAITS,

Price 10 Cents Each,

OR TWENTY COPIES FOR ONE DOLLAR.

Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of the price.

Published by WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN,
606 CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

LIST OF PORTRAITS ALREADY ISSUED, OR PREPARING.

MILITARY OFFICERS:

GEN. WASHINGTON.	GEN. LANDER.	GEN. BENHAM.
“ SCOTT.	“ KEYES.	“ HUNTER.
“ McCLELLAN.	“ NEGLEY.	“ VIELE.
“ McDOWELL.	“ BUELL.	“ PORTER.
“ SHERMAN, at Port Royal.	“ WADSWORTH.	COL. BERDAN.
“ KELLY.	“ ORD.	“ GEARY.
“ McCALL.	“ COX.	“ WISTAR.
“ HALLECK.	“ REYNOLDS.	“ HOFFMAN.
“ SUMNER.	“ SCHOEPFF.	“ RUSH.
LIEUT. COL. KANE.	CAPT. EASTON.	

NAVAL OFFICERS:

COMMODORE L. M. GOLDSBOROUGH.	COMMODORE WILKES.
“ FOOT, in command of the Mississippi Fleet.	COMMANDER R. F. GOLDSBOROUGH, At Port Royal.
“ DUPONT.	Com. HOLLINS, (Rebel)
LIEUT. FAIRFAX.	

CIVILIANS:

PRESIDENT LINCOLN.	HON. E. BATES.
VICE PRESIDENT HAMLIN.	“ C. B. SMITH.
HONOURABLE W. H. SEWARD.	“ A. M. ELY.
“ E. M. STANTON,	REV. CHARLES HODGE, D. D.
“ S. P. CHASE.	“ ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D.